

Appln. No. 10/619,235

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1802

II. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

Claims 3-30 and 32-39 remain pending. Claims 40-42 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 3-11, 14, 17-25, 28, and 32-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,686,911 to Levin et al. (Levin).

The elements of claims 40-42 have been integrated into claims 4, 17, and 32 respectively. Accordingly, the amendment should not necessitate additional searching beyond what was already required to address claims 40-42.

Claims 4, 17, and 32 include a visual indicator to identify a location of a knob used to control the selection. The visual indicator may correspond to the flare 32 shown in the highlight bar 30 of Figures 2, 3, and 4 of the instant application. In Figure 2, the flare 32 is located adjacent knob 16 identifying knob 16 as the knob that controls the selection. In Figure 3, the flare 32 is located adjacent knob 18 indicating that knob 18 controls the selection. Similarly, in Figure 4, the flare 32 is located adjacent knob 20 indicating knob 20 controls the selection. The examiner relies on Levin to teach this element and specifically refers to Figure 2, for example icon 46. However, icon 46 does not identify the location of the corresponding knob that controls the selection. Since no relation



BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
PO Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610

Appln. No. 10/619,235

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1802

exists between the icons in Figure 2 and the location of the knob that controls the selection. Levin does not teach or suggest the present invention as provided in claims 4, 17, and 32. Claims 3, 5-11, 14, 16-25, 18, and 33-42 depend from claims 4, 17, or 32 and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claims 4, 17, and 32. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 12-13, 15-16, 26-27, and 29-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Levin '911 in view of McDowall '479.

Claims 12-13, 15-16, 26-27, and 29-30 depend from claims 4, 17, or 32 and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claims 4, 17, and 32. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of



BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
PO Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610


Appln. No. 10/619,235

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1802

record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted by,

Dated: December 18, 2006


Robert K. Fergan
Reg. No.: 51,674
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610
(734) 302-6000

BRINKS
HOFER
GILSON
& LIONE

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
PO Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610